

acceptable to the target party, and

when the comparison indicates that the desired remedy is acceptable to the target party, automatically, by the computer on behalf of the target party, advising the complainer that the desired remedy will be provided by the target party.

51. A method of processing a complaint, comprising:

at a computer, receiving from a complainer,

**problem circumstances relating to a prior transaction with a target party
and**

a remedy desired from the target party,

automatically comparing, at the computer, the problem circumstances with stored business rules previously created by the target party to determine if the desired remedy is acceptable to the target party, and

when the comparison indicates that the desired remedy is not acceptable to the target party, automatically, by the computer on behalf of the target party, providing a remedy offer to the complainer in accordance with the stored business rules.

56. A method of processing a complaint, comprising:

at a computer, receiving from a complainer,

**problem circumstances relating to a prior transaction with a target party
and**

a remedy desired from the target party,

automatically comparing, at the computer, the problem circumstances with stored business rules previously created by the target party to determine if the desired remedy is acceptable to the target party,

when the comparison indicates that the desired remedy is acceptable to the target party, automatically, by the computer, providing the desired remedy to the complainer, and
when the comparison indicates that the desired remedy is not acceptable to the target party, automatically, by the computer, offering a remedy in accordance with the stored business rules that, when accepted by the complainer, is provided by the computer to the complainer.

Specifically, the claims plainly requires two items from a complainer: first, problem circumstances, and second, a remedy. The problem circumstances are “problem circumstances

relating to a prior transaction with a target party”. The remedy is “a remedy desired from the target party”. The meaning of the remedy appears to be in accordance with what the Examiner expects, with no claim changes needed.

Withdrawal of the paragraph 3 rejection of claims 43-63 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, is requested.

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claims 43-63 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite due to issues with claims 43, 51 and 56. The Examiner correctly noted that the comparing step only compares the problem circumstances with the stored business rules, and then correctly stated that the point of the comparison is to determine if the desired remedy is acceptable. The Examiner seems to believe that the claims should recite comparing the complainer’s desired remedy with the target party’s acceptable remedy, as determined by its business rules.

Patent specifications are not production specifications, and patent claims are not manufacturing instructions. Patent claims need not recite all details of a process to be definite. The claims are definite as is. The claims call for making a comparison to determine if a desired remedy is acceptable. The claims definitely state what is compared to arrive at this outcome. The claims need not explain the various steps of the comparison to be definite. The specification supports the claimed subject matter.

Withdrawal of the paragraph 4 rejection of claims 43-63 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, is requested.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, claim 53 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claim 53 and parent claims 51-52 are as follows:

51. A method of processing a complaint, comprising:
at a computer, receiving from a complainer, problem circumstances relating to a prior transaction with a target party and a remedy desired from the target party,
automatically comparing, at the computer, the problem circumstances with stored business rules previously created by the target party to determine if the desired remedy is acceptable to the target party, and
when the comparison indicates that the desired remedy is not acceptable to the target party, automatically, by the computer on behalf of the target party, providing a remedy offer to

the complainer in accordance with the stored business rules.

52. The method of claim 51, wherein at least one of the stored business rules specifies, for a problem type, at least one acceptable remedy, and wherein the acceptable remedy is provided as the remedy offer.

53. The method of claim 52, wherein when multiple acceptable remedies are specified in the stored business rules, the remedy offer includes the multiple acceptable remedies.

Rewriting claim 53 to explicitly show the features of its parent claims is as follows:

53. A method of processing a complaint, comprising:
at a computer, receiving from a complainer, problem circumstances relating to a prior transaction with a target party and a remedy desired from the target party,
automatically comparing, at the computer, the problem circumstances with stored business rules previously created by the target party to determine if the desired remedy is acceptable to the target party,
wherein at least one of the stored business rules specifies, for a problem type, at least one acceptable remedy,
so that multiple acceptable remedies are specified in the stored business rules
and
when the comparison indicates that the desired remedy is not acceptable to the target party, automatically, by the computer on behalf of the target party, providing the multiple acceptable remedies in a remedy offer to the complainer in accordance with the stored business rules.

Claim 53 is definite. The Examiner provided language not found in claim 53 and stated her language was unclear. Applicant agrees with Examiner that Examiner's language is unclear; but Examiner's language is not part of claim 53, so there is no reason to reject claim 53.

Withdrawal of the paragraph 5 rejection of claims 53 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, is requested.

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, claims 43-63 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sloo.

The present claims relate to a complaint processing system that has stored business rules previously created by the target of the complaint, so that the computer can automatically respond

on behalf of the target. An advantage is that the target does not need to spend time on routine complaints. Another advantage is that the complainer gets an immediate response.

Sloo fails to show or suggest a complaint processing system that has stored business rules previously created by the target of the complaint, so that the computer can automatically respond on behalf of the target. Instead, Sloo teaches a process wherein the target of the complaint responds individually to each complaint. In high complaint volume situations, Sloo requires an enormous amount of time for complaint handling on behalf of the target of the complaint.

The Examiner cited portions of Sloo describing an "Automatic Negotiator" option (column 7, lines 37-39; column 9, lines 57-61) wherein a complainer can request Sloo's system automatically enter a judgment on her complaint. However, there is no indication that the target of the complaint has, in any way, authorized automatic decision making by Sloo's system, and there is further no reason why a target of a complaint should be bound by the results of Sloo's system. Sloo's data records from previously resolved complaints do not indicate any participation or acceptance by the target party; they are just data records generated by Sloo's system acting autonomously.

It flies in the face of the American due process constitutional legal right that a privately established system should bind an unrelated target party.

There is nothing in Sloo that shows or suggests working with target parties to obtain their business rules previous to submission of complaints, storing these business rules, and then using them to respond to complaints as required by the present claims. Accordingly, there is no way of applying Sloo to render claims 43-63 obvious.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 43-63 under 35 USC 103 is requested.

Early and favorable consideration of this application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 28, 2005


Brenda Pomerance

Address:
260 West 52 St. Ste. 27B
New York, NY 10019
voice/fax 212 245-3940